

CANONICAL RESOLUTION OF A QUASI-ORDINARY SURFACE SINGULARITY

CHUNSHENG BAN AND LEE J. MCEWAN

ABSTRACT. We describe the embedded resolution of a quasi-ordinary surface singularity (V, p) which results from applying the canonical resolution of Bierstone-Milman to (V, p) . We show that this process depends solely on the characteristic pairs of (V, p) , as predicted by Lipman. We describe the process explicitly enough that a resolution graph for f could in principle be obtained by computer using only the characteristic pairs.

INTRODUCTION. The Jungian approach to resolving the singularities of an embedded surface $V \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ begins with a projection $\pi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ with (reduced) discriminant locus $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}^2$. Let $\sigma: (M, \sigma^{-1}(\Delta)) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, \Delta)$ be an embedded resolution of the plane curve Δ . Thus, M is smooth (of dimension 2) and $\sigma^{-1}(\Delta)$ has only normal crossings. The bimeromorphic map σ and the projection π induce a bimeromorphic map $\sigma': V' = V \times_{\mathbb{C}^2} M \rightarrow V$, and a projection $\pi': V' \rightarrow M$ whose discriminant locus has only normal crossings. We have the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 V' & \xrightarrow{\sigma'} & V \\
 \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
 M & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \mathbb{C}^2
 \end{array}$$

$\swarrow \sigma^{-1}(\Delta)$ $\searrow \Delta$

This leads us to consider surface singularities in $\mathbb{C}^3$ admitting a local finite projection to $\mathbb{C}^2$ with normal crossings. Such singularities are called quasi-ordinary.¹ Lipman and others have studied this kind of singularity in detail (cf. [L1], [L2], [L3], and [G]). Each quasi-ordinary singularity is equipped with a set of pairs $\{(\lambda, \mu)\}$ of non-negative rational numbers, called characteristic pairs. These pairs determine much of the geometry and topology of the singularity.

One approach to understanding a quasi-ordinary singularity is to study its resolution. In [L1], Lipman described a definite procedure for resolving a quasi-ordinary surface singularity (V, p) embedded in $\mathbb{C}^3$ (for an outline of this procedure, see [L2], pages 164–165 and pages 169–171). He shows that at each stage of the resolution, the singular locus remains quasi-ordinary, and the characteristic pairs at each stage are determined by those of the previous stage and the process employed. In this paper we study the *embedded resolution* of a quasi-ordinary surface singularity. Recently, several constructive algorithms for canonical embedded resolution of singularities have emerged; see Bierstone and Milman ([BM1], [BM2]), Villamayor

¹Higher dimensional quasi-ordinary singularities are similarly defined. In this paper we only consider surface singularities in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

([EV]), and Moh ([M]). In this note we apply Bierstone and Milman's algorithm. Specifically, we replace Lipman's procedure by applying Bierstone and Milman's algorithm for canonical embedded resolution, and show that at each stage of the algorithm, the center to blow up is determined by the characteristic pairs and the process employed. Thus we establish a canonical embedded resolution for quasi-ordinary surfaces; the fact that the data of the resolution depend only on characteristic pairs will be used in a sequel to prove the existence of simultaneous embedded resolution for equisingular families.

The authors are thankful for several conversations and/or correspondences with E. Bierstone, G. Kennedy, J. Lipman, O. Villamayor and S. Encinas. A partial version of these results were obtained earlier in terms of the algorithm of [V], [EV]. We ultimately found it easier to use the more explicit bottom-up approach of Bierstone and Milman's treatment of canonical resolution, but we learned this subject equally from E. Bierstone, O. Villamayor and S. Encinas. We gratefully acknowledge our debt to them. We are told that S. S. Abhyankar has presented a proof of our main result in a new appendix to the second edition of his book [A], which we have not seen, but which may not contain an explicit recipe in terms of the characteristic pairs.

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Quasi-ordinary Singularities. A quasi-ordinary singularity is an analytic germ (V, p) of dimension d which admits a finite map of analytic germs $\pi: (V, p) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^d, 0)$ whose discriminant locus Δ (the hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^d$ over which π ramifies) has only normal crossings. We consider a quasi-ordinary surface singularity embedded in $(\mathbb{C}^3, 0)$ here. In this case, we can choose local coordinates x, y, z such that $\pi(x, y, z) = (x, y)$ and such that (V, p) is defined by an equation

$$f(x, y, z) = z^m + c_{m-1}(x, y)z^{m-1} + \cdots + c_0(x, y) = 0$$

where the c_i are power series. Then (V, p) being quasi-ordinary means that the *discriminant* $D(x, y)$ of f (considered as a polynomial in z) has the form

$$D(x, y) = x^a y^b \epsilon(x, y), \quad \epsilon(0, 0) \neq 0.$$

It is known that the roots of f are fractional power series. Let $\zeta = H(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n})$ be one root of f ($H(x, y)$ a power series). The other roots (the conjugates of ζ) can be expressed as

$$\zeta_i = H_i(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n}) = H(\omega_{i1}x^{1/n}, \omega_{i2}y^{1/n})$$

with the ω_{ij} the n -th roots of unity. By letting $\zeta_1 = \zeta$, the polynomial f can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y, z) &= z^m + c_{m-1}(x, y)z^{m-1} + \cdots + c_0(x, y) \\ (1) \quad &= \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \zeta_i), \end{aligned}$$

so that the c_i are the elementary symmetric functions of ζ_i . We call ζ a parametrization of (V, p) .

Since $x^a y^b \epsilon(x, y) = D(x, y) = \prod_{i \neq j} (\zeta_i - \zeta_j)$, we have

$$\zeta_i - \zeta_j = x^{u/n} y^{v/n} \epsilon_{ij}(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n}), \quad \epsilon_{ij}(0, 0) \neq 0$$

for some u and v (depending on i, j). The fractional monomials $M_{ij} = x^{u/n}y^{v/n}$ so obtained are called the *characteristic monomials* of ζ , and the exponents $(u/n, v/n)$ are called the *characteristic pairs* of ζ . These pairs satisfy certain conditions (cf. [L2], Proposition 1.5); for example, they are totally ordered by $(\lambda_1, \mu_1) \leq (\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ if and only if $x^{\lambda_1}y^{\mu_1}$ divides $x^{\lambda_2}y^{\mu_2}$ (i.e. $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$). It turns out that these pairs determine quite a lot of the geometry and topology of (V, p) (cf. [L1], [L2], [L3], and [G]).

Although a quasi-ordinary singularity may have different characteristic pairs which depend on the choice of ζ , the characteristic pairs of a *normalized* parametrization determine and are determined by the local topological type of (V, p) (cf. [G]); that is, there is a set of characteristic pairs which are independent of the choice of ζ .

Definition 1.1. A parametrization

$$\zeta = x^{a/n}y^{b/n}H(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n}),$$

where $H(0, 0) \neq 0$ is *normalized* if

1. a and b are not both divisible by n ,
2. if $a + b < n$, then both $a > 0$ and $b > 0$,
3. labeling the characteristic pairs $(\lambda_i, \mu_i)_{1 \leq i \leq s}$ of ζ so that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_s$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_s$, we have $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s) \geq (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_s)$ (lexicographically).

Lemma 1.2. Any parametrization ζ of a quasi-ordinary singularity (V, p) can be changed to a normalized one by the following type of change of coordinates:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (i) & \begin{array}{l} x' = x \\ y' = y \\ z' = z - p(x, y) \end{array} & (ii) \quad \begin{array}{l} x' = z \\ y' = y \\ z' = x \end{array} & (iii) \quad \begin{array}{l} x' = y \\ y' = x \\ z' = z \end{array} \end{array}$$

Proof. Let $p(x, y)$ be the sum of the terms $x^\alpha y^\beta$ in ζ with α, β both integers. By a change of type (i), we get a parametrization $\zeta' = \zeta - p(x, y)$. By the property of characteristic pairs (cf. [L2], Proposition 1.5), the smallest characteristic monomial divides every term in ζ' . So, $\zeta' = x^{\lambda_1}y^{\mu_1}H(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n})$ for some H . Therefore, we may assume that $\zeta = x^{\lambda_1}y^{\mu_1}H(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n})$, and 1 in (1.1) is satisfied. If 2 in (1.1) is not satisfied, from the proof of the *inversion formula* (cf. [G], Appendix) a change of type (ii) can take care of this. Upon a change of type (iii), 3 in (1.1) can be obtained. $\square$

1.2. Resolution of Quasi-ordinary Singularities. In [L1] J. Lipman described a definite procedure to resolve a quasi-ordinary singularity (for an outline of this procedure, see [L2], pages 164–165 and pages 169–171). This procedure determines a tree of *special transforms* of a quasi-ordinary singularity (V, p) . Each special transform in this tree is again a quasi-ordinary singularity. The center to blow up at each stage is determined by the characteristic pairs, and the characteristic pairs of the resulting special transform are determined by the pairs in the previous stage and the process employed (cf. [L2], Theorem 3.3). Let

$$(2) \quad \zeta = x^\lambda y^\mu H(x^{1/n}, y^{1/n}), \quad H(0, 0) \neq 0$$

be a normalized parametrization of a quasi-ordinary singularity (V, p) , where $p = (0, 0, 0)$ is the origin. Roughly speaking, we blow up a *permissible curve* (an equimultiple curve) whenever it is possible, and a point otherwise. The possible permissible curve is the plane section cut out by coordinate plane $x = 0$ (if $\lambda \geq 1$) or $y = 0$ (if $\mu \geq 1$). By Bierstone-Milman's algorithm, however, we will at sometime blow up a point even though there is a permissible curve.

The following lemma by Lipman shows how the characteristic pairs change after blowing up the origin (quadratic transform) or a permissible curve (monoidal transform). (cf. [L2], Theorem 3.3.)

Lemma 1.3. *(omit $i = 1$ if the corresponding pair consists of integers.)*

Transformation	Pairs of resulting branch
MONOIDAL TRANSFORMATION	
Center (x, z)	$\lambda_i - 1, \mu_i$
Center (y, z)	$\lambda_i, \mu_i - 1$
QUADRATIC TRANSFORMATION	
"Transversal Case" ($\lambda_1 + \mu_1 \geq 1$)	
Direction $(1 : 0 : 0)$	$\lambda_i + \mu_i - 1, \mu_i$
Direction $(0 : 1 : 0)$	$\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i - 1$
"Non-Transversal Case" ($\lambda_1 + \mu_1 < 1$)	
Direction $(1 : 0 : 0)$	$\lambda_i + \frac{(1 + \mu_i)(1 - \lambda_1)}{\mu_1} - 2, \frac{1 + \mu_i}{\mu_1} - 1$
Direction $(0 : 1 : 0)$	$\mu_i + \frac{(1 + \lambda_i)(1 - \mu_1)}{\lambda_1} - 2, \frac{1 + \lambda_i}{\lambda_1} - 1$
Direction $(0 : 0 : 1)$	$\frac{\lambda_i(1 - \mu_1) + \mu_i\lambda_1}{1 - \lambda_1 - \mu_1}, \frac{\lambda_i\mu_1 + \mu_i(1 - \lambda_1)}{1 - \lambda_1 - \mu_1}$

In the case of quadratic transformation, we will call the directions $(1 : 0 : 0)$, $(0 : 1 : 0)$, and $(0 : 0 : 1)$ the x -, y -, and z -charts respectively.

2. EMBEDDED RESOLUTION

Let $f(x, y, z)$ define a quasi-ordinary singularity germ at the origin, and let $\{(\lambda_i, \mu_i)\}$ be the collection of characteristic pairs for f . We describe the embedded resolution of f which results from applying the canonical resolution algorithm of [BM1] to f . We show that this process depends solely on the characteristic pairs of f . We also describe the process explicitly; from our description the characteristic data could be fed to a computer to output a resolution graph. To describe the process we divide the problem into two natural stages. First we show how to reduce the multiplicity of f for the first time; we call this "the base case." Then we show how to reduce the multiplicity starting from a "general configuration." For this we define a configuration of exceptional divisors arising after the multiplicity has decreased, and show that it is stable.

2.1. Outline of Bierstone-Milman's canonical resolution. The centers for blowing-up an arbitrary germ f are chosen by a process that can be briefly outlined as follows. Using the Weierstrass Preparation Theorem, f is written as a pseudo-polynomial of degree m in a variable z , where m is the multiplicity of f . It can also be arranged that the coefficient of the z^{m-1} term vanishes. Then the surface $N_1 = \{z = 0\}$ defines a "maximal contact-space" for f . The coefficients of f are regarded

as functions on N_1 , one dimension lower than the ambient dimension. From this collection, a (weighted) “higher order multiplicity” is defined and a function is selected which achieves this multiplicity, which sets up an induction on decreasing dimension. As the procedure is iterated, the accumulated exceptional divisors are factored out or included in the coefficient set, depending on when they occurred in the history of the resolution. Because the codimension cannot increase indefinitely, the process must end. It does so in one of two ways:

1. At some stage, there are no more coefficient functions. Then the last maximal contact space is contained in the vanishing locus of the previous set of coefficient functions. The final multiplicity is infinity, the order of vanishing of 0. Since the contact space is automatically smooth, it becomes the natural choice of center for the next blow-up.
2. A multiplicity of zero is obtained. This occurs when the set of coefficient functions is generated by a product of exceptional divisors (which are factored out before the multiplicity is computed; zero is the order of vanishing of 1). In the language of [A], [H], the coefficient ideal is principalized. Each component of the maximum locus of the invariant is an intersection of exceptional divisors, which is smooth by the inductive requirement of normal crossings. There is a rule, based on the order in history of the exceptional divisors, which determines a component to select as the next center.

The details of this procedure are organized into an invariant inv_f which consists of a finite sequence of non-negative rational numbers. The terms of the sequence are just the weighted multiplicities ν_i described above and the numbers s_i of exceptional planes occurring in stages of history between which the invariant decreased. The numbers s_i reflect the “age” of exceptional planes; for example, s_1 counts the oldest planes, those which occurred before the first multiplicity ν_1 decreased.

Ordered lexicographically, inv_f is an upper-semi-continuous function on the points of $\{f = 0\}$. Its maximum locus defines smooth components which can be ordered to define canonical centers for blowing up. All of these facts are explained and proved in [BM1], [BM2].

For quasi-ordinary singularities, we define a “general configuration of exceptional divisors”, and show that it is stable under every transformation that is needed in the resolution. (The transformations we use are blow-ups of points and curves, permuting coordinates, and collecting integral powers, *i.e.* the transformations used in Lemmas 1.2 and 1.3). We also show that whenever the multiplicity decreases and the strict transform is normalized, the resulting collection of exceptional divisors constitutes a general configuration.

The resolution will be presented in two stages; the first stage is the base where E , the collection of exceptional hyperplanes, is empty. The second stage is the case where the multiplicity has just dropped, and E is the general configuration. The first stage sets up the second; we will also use calculations in the first stage to introduce the machinery of Bierstone-Milman’s canonical embedded resolution.

2.2. Stage One. Let $f = z^m + \cdots + c_0(x, y)$ be a quasi-ordinary germ in normalized form, and let (λ, μ) be the first characteristic pair. Assume this is the beginning of the resolution and $E = \emptyset$. By a series of canonically-chosen centers, we blow-up f until its multiplicity has been lowered. We distinguish two cases: (i) $\lambda + \mu < 1$ (the “non-transverse case” according to Lipman) and (ii) $\lambda + \mu \geq 1$ (the “transverse

case"). It is easy to see that the multiplicity ν_1 of f is $m(\lambda + \mu)$ in case (i) and m in case (ii).

Case (i) $\lambda + \mu < 1$

Since f is normalized, $\lambda\mu \neq 0$. It follows immediately that the multiplicity of f at the origin is strictly greater than at any nearby point. Since ν_1 is the first entry in inv_f , the invariant is maximized at the origin. Thus in this case, the canonical center is immediately determined by the first characteristic pair: the center is the origin. In particular it's not necessary to compute the entire sequence inv_f to determine the center in this case.

We blow up the origin and examine three coordinate charts where the strict transforms are determined by $x^{-\nu_1}f(x, xy, xz)$, $y^{-\nu_1}f(xy, y, yz)$, and $z^{-\nu_1}f(xz, yz, z)$, respectively. We will call them x -, y - and z -charts. (Lipman used the term $(1 : 0 : 0)$, $(0 : 1 : 0)$ and $(0 : 0 : 1)$ directions, respectively in [L2].)

In the x -chart we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{-\nu_1}f(x, xy, xz) &= x^{-\nu_1}(x^m z^m + \cdots + c_0(\zeta_i(x, xy))) \\ &= x^{m-\nu_1} z^m + \cdots + y^{\nu_1 m} \cdot \text{unit}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lipman's formula (Lemma 1.3), the multiplicity has been lowered to $\nu'_1 = \mu m$. To restore f to (perhaps non-normalized) quasi-ordinary form, exchange variables y and z and apply the preparation theorem. We obtain

$$f' = z^{\mu m} + \cdots + c'_0(\zeta'_i),$$

where the new data is:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda', \mu') &= \left(\frac{1 - \lambda - \mu}{\mu}, \frac{1}{\mu} \right) \\ \nu'_1 &= \mu m < (\lambda + \mu)m = \nu_1. \end{aligned}$$

Note also that $\mu' > 1$ and so f' is in the transverse case. f' is again a pseudo polynomial defining a quasi-ordinary singularity, but it may not be normalized: a branch may contain integer powers. To normalize f' , replace z by $z - p(x, y)$ where p is the (convergent) power series of all terms in ζ' with integral exponents. Assume for now that λ', μ' are not both integral, *i.e.* that f' does not lose a characteristic pair. It follows from the characterization of quasi-ordinary parametrization that $x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'} | p(x, y)$. The final configuration is

$$(3) \quad f' = z^{m'} + \cdots + (x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'})^{m'} \cdot u, \quad E = \{(y)\}$$

and the multiplicity has dropped.

The y -chart is exactly parallel. In the z -chart, several blow-ups of the origin are required (their number depends only on (λ, μ)). Using Lemma 1.3 again, m and (λ, μ) transform to $m' = m - \nu_1$ and $(\lambda', \mu') = (\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda-\mu}, \frac{\mu}{1-\lambda-\mu})$; so long as the new (λ', μ') satisfies $\lambda' + \mu' < 1$, the multiplicity remains unchanged. The strict transform is automatically in quasi-ordinary form and the multiplicity is still maximized at the origin, which must be the next center. Iterating this process, we continue to blow up origins in the new z -charts until $\lambda' + \mu' \geq 1$. This last condition occurs after $k = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu} \right\rceil$ blow-ups, where $[x]$ is the greatest integer function. The final configuration is

$$f' = z^{m'} + \cdots + x^{\lambda m} y^{\mu m} \cdot \text{unit}, \quad E = \{(z)\}$$

and $m' = m(1 - k(\lambda + \mu)) = \nu'_1$. By the definition of k , $\nu'_1 < \nu_1$. Using Lipman's formula,

$$(\lambda', \mu') = \left(\frac{\lambda m}{m'}, \frac{\mu m}{m'} \right) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - k(\lambda + \mu)}, \frac{\mu}{1 - k(\lambda + \mu)} \right).$$

So $\lambda' + \mu' > 1$, and f' is in the transverse case.

In x - or y -charts occurring after the first z -chart, the multiplicity drops after just one blow-up. The final configuration is the same as (3) except E also contains (z) .

Case (ii) $\lambda + \mu \geq 1$

We have in this case $\nu_1 = m$. We assume that $\lambda\mu \neq 0$. (The case where $\lambda\mu = 0$ is simpler.) We assume that f is normalized and ζ contains no terms with both its exponents integral. It follows that the coefficient of z^{m-1} in f is zero. Therefore in this case, a normalized quasi-ordinary germ has a smooth maximal contact space given by the hyperplane defined by $z = 0$. We will illustrate the calculation of inv_f and the determination of centers for a few steps, and then summarize the resolution for this case of stage one.

Proceeding inductively on dimension, let $\mathcal{H}_1$ be the collection of coefficients of f , regarded as functions on $N_1 = \{z = 0\}$. More precisely, $\mathcal{H}_1$ is the set of pairs $(c_q, m - q)$ where c_q is the coefficient of z^q . The number $m - q$ is the weighted multiplicity assigned to c_q . Following [BM1], define

$$\mu_2 := \min \left\{ \frac{\mu(h)}{\mu_h} \mid (h, \mu_h) \in \mathcal{H}_1 \right\}$$

where $\mu(h)$ is the order of h at $O \in N_1$. While $E = \emptyset$ we define $\nu_2 = \mu_2$; ν_2 is the “second multiplicity” at O . Now let

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \{(h_1, \nu_2 \cdot \mu_h) \mid (h, \mu_h) \in \mathcal{H}_1\}.$$

Then there must be a pair $(g_*, \mu_{g_*}) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ such that $\mu(g_*) = \mu_{g_*}$. From here we repeat the construction: we find a (linear) change of coordinates which leaves z unchanged such that a second variable defines a maximal contact space $N_2 \subset N_1$ for the function g_* . Restricting the coefficients of g_* to N_2 , define $\mathcal{H}_2$ and ν_3 .

The salient points of this construction are: (see [BM1] and [BM2] for proofs and details)

- The numbers ν_i are analytic invariants of the singularity.
- The construction at latter steps of the resolution is amended to reflect the presence of exceptional divisors.
- The collection $\mathcal{G}_i$ can be replaced by an equivalent collection to make calculations simpler; an “equivalent” collection defines the same value for the invariant in a way that is stable after blowing-up. If $(g, \mu_g) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ satisfies $\mu(g) = \mu_g$, and g splits into factors $g = \prod g_i^{m_i}$, then (g, μ_g) can be replaced by the pairs (g_i, μ_{g_i}) , $\mu_{g_i} = \mu(g_i)$, to obtain an equivalent collection.

Now we complete the calculation of inv_f in the current setting of $\lambda + \mu \geq 1$ and $E = \emptyset$. We have

$$f = z^m + c_{m-2}(x, y)z^{m-2} + \cdots + c_0(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \zeta_i).$$

Each c_q is a symmetric function of the ζ_i . We have

$$c_0(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^m \zeta_i(x, y) = x^{m\lambda} y^{m\mu} \cdot \text{unit},$$

and

$$c_q(x, y) = (x^\lambda y^\mu)^{m-q} \cdot e_q(x, y),$$

where e_q is a fractional power series, possibly a non-unit. This is a general phenomenon: for any quasi-ordinary singularity, c_0 “divides” the other coefficients in a weighted sense: h_1 “divides” h_2 if $h_1^{\mu_{h_2}} \mid h_2^{\mu_{h_1}}$. So, c_0 determines the next weighted multiplicity. Therefore,

$$\nu_2 = \mu_2 = \frac{m(\lambda + \mu)}{m} = \lambda + \mu.$$

The pair $(g, \mu_g) = (c_0, \nu_2 \cdot m) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ satisfies $\mu(g) = \mu_g$, and since c_0 factors, we can replace it by the pairs $(x, 1)$ and $(y, 1)$. (Here we use the assumption $\lambda\mu \neq 0$.) The function $(y, 1)$ already defines a second maximal contact space: $N_2 = (y, z) \subset N_1 = (z)$. As before, $\mathcal{H}_2$ is the collection of coefficient functions of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_2$, written as polynomials in y . Thus $(x, 1) \in \mathcal{H}_2$, and all other functions (h, μ_h) of $\mathcal{H}_2$ satisfy $\mu(h) \geq \mu_h$. Therefore, $\nu_3 = \mu_3 = 1$. There are no more variables left to define coefficient functions, and ν_4 is defined to be ∞ . We define $s_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and

$$\text{inv}_f = (\nu_1, s_1; \nu_2, s_2; \nu_3, s_3; \nu_4) = (m, 0; \lambda + \mu, 0; 1, 0; \infty).$$

When inv_f ends in the value ∞ , the last contact space is chosen as the center. In this case, $N_3 = (x, y, z)$ defines the origin. Note that the invariant depends only on the characteristic data of f , since m is determined by that data.

The procedure for reducing the multiplicity falls into a handful of cases; we’ll describe one case completely and then summarize the others.

—Year One

Blow-up the origin and examine the chart defined by x . The strict transform f' remains in quasi-ordinary form, assuming the multiplicity has not dropped. Let O' be the origin in this chart. Set $E(O') = \{H_x\}$ where $H_x = (x)$ is the exceptional divisor. Define $E^1 \subset E(O')$ to be the collection of exceptional hyperplanes $\{H' \mid H' \text{ is the strict transform of } H \in E(O)\}$ where O is the point that was blown up. Since $E(O) = \emptyset$, $E^1(O') = \emptyset$. In general, $E^1(O')$ are those exceptional hyperplanes at O' which are pulled back from the earliest stage of resolution in which f had the same multiplicity as it does now. $E^{i+1}(O') \subset E \setminus \cup_{q=1}^i E^q$ is defined similarly, replacing the multiplicity by the first part of the invariant, namely the string $\text{inv}_{i-\frac{1}{2}} = (\nu_1, s_1; \dots; \nu_i)$. The numbers s_i are defined as the cardinalities of the sets E^i .

For clarity, we’ll work through the machinery for calculating inv_f in the current chart; after this we give just the essential calculations.

Let $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{(f', m)\}$ be the strict transform of f , which we’ve assumed retains the same multiplicity. Let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{G}_1 \cup (E^1, 1)$, where $(E^i, 1) = \{(g, 1) \mid g \in E^i\}$ (Currently, $E^1 = \emptyset$ so $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1$). From $\mathcal{F}_1$ we draw a function with $\mu(g) = \mu_g$, and use it to define N_1 . Of course, (f', m) is the only choice; since f' is already expressed as a normalized quasi-ordinary singularity, we may take $N_1 = (z)$. As before, $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{(c_i', m-i)\}$ where the c_i' are the coefficients of f' as a polynomial in

z . We see that $\mu_2 = \frac{m(\lambda' + \mu')}{m} = \lambda' + \mu'$, where (λ', μ') is the first characteristic pair for f' , which can be obtained from Lipman's formula (1.3).

In general, μ_2 is modified to take exceptional divisors into account. Let $(y_H) = H \in \mathcal{E}_1 = E \setminus E^1$ and define $\mu_{2H} = \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1} \frac{\mu_H(h)}{\mu_h}$ where $\mu_H(h)$ denotes the order to which y_H factors out of h . Then $\nu_2 := \mu_2 - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{E}_1} \mu_{2H}$. Define $D_2 := \prod_{H \in \mathcal{E}_1} y_H^{\mu_{2H}}$.

By construction, D_2^m is the greatest common divisor of the elements of $\mathcal{H}_1$ that is a monomial in exceptional coordinates y_H , $H \in \mathcal{E}_1$. For each $h \in \mathcal{H}_1$, write $h = D_2^m \cdot g$ and $\mu_g := \mu_h \cdot \nu_2$. Then $\mathcal{G}_2$ is defined to be the collection $\{(g, \mu_g)\}$ for all $(h, \mu_h) \in \mathcal{H}_1$ as above, together with the pair $(D_2^m, (1 - \nu_2) \cdot m)$ if $\nu_2 < 1$. This completes a cycle in the definition of inv_f .

Now calculate explicitly: $c_0' = (x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'})^m \cdot \text{unit}$ is the principalizing element of $\mathcal{H}_1$, and $\mathcal{E}_1 = E \setminus E^1 = \{H_x\}$ where $H_x = (x)$. Clearly $\mu_{H_x} = \lambda'$, so $\nu_2 = \mu'$ and $D_2 = x^{\lambda'}$. We will assume that $\lambda \geq 1$ and $\mu \geq 1$; using Lipman's formula, $\mu = \mu'$, so $\nu_2 \geq 1$, and D_2 is not included in $\mathcal{G}_2$. We may exclude functions from $\mathcal{G}_2$ which are divisible by some other function in $\mathcal{G}_2$. We have $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{(y^{\mu'} m, \mu' m)\} \sim \{(y, 1)\}$. The first stage of the invariant, $\text{inv}_{1\frac{1}{2}}$, is $(m, 0; \mu') = (m, 0; \mu)$. Before blowing up, $\text{inv}_{1\frac{1}{2}} = (m, 0; \lambda + \mu)$, so $\text{inv}_{1\frac{1}{2}}$ has decreased. Therefore $E^2 = \{H_x\}$, and $\mathcal{E}_2$ is defined to be $\mathcal{E}_1 \setminus E^2 = \emptyset$. We have $s_2 = 1$, and $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{G}_2 \cup (E^2, 1) = \{(x, 1), (y, 1)\}$. It's now clear that we may take (y, z) and (x, y, z) to successively define maximal contact spaces, and $\nu_3 = 1$, $s_3 = 0$, $\nu_4 = \infty$. We have $\text{inv}_f = (m, 0; \mu', 1; 1, 0; \infty)$. The last maximal contact space is the origin, which must be the next center to blow-up.

—Year Two

Blow up the origin, and again examine the x -chart. As before, the strict transform is a normalized quasi-ordinary polynomial. The assumption $\lambda \geq 1$, $\mu \geq 1$ implies the multiplicity cannot decrease by blowing up the origin, so $\nu_1 = m$. It follows that $E^1 = \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{G}_1$ contains only the strict transform, which we will again denote as f . Then as before $N_1 = (z)$, and $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{(c_0, m)\}$ (we ignore all higher coefficient functions, which are divisible by c_0). Again we have $\mu_2 = \lambda'' + \mu''$, where (λ'', μ'') is the current first characteristic pair, and $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{H_x\}$ leads to $\mu_{2H_x} = \lambda''$ and $\nu_2 = \mu''$. Using Lipman's formula, $\mu'' = \mu$ and $\text{inv}_{1\frac{1}{2}} = (m, 0; \mu)$. This time $\text{inv}_{1\frac{1}{2}}$ does not drop, so $E^2 = \emptyset$ (the exceptional divisor from the previous stage is blown-away), and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{E}_1 \setminus E^2 = \{H_x\}$. Then $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{G}_2 = \{(y^{\mu} m, \mu m)\} \sim \{(y, 1)\}$. The next maximal contact space N_2 is defined by y restricted to N_1 , i.e. $N_2 = (y, z)$. There are no coefficient functions contributed to $\mathcal{H}_2$ by the only function $(y, 1)$ belonging to $\mathcal{F}_2$, so $\nu_3 = \infty$. We have $\text{inv}_f = (m, 0; \mu, 0; \infty)$ at this stage. The next center is defined by N_2 , which is the x -axis. Note that by assuming $\mu \geq 1$, the x -axis is equimultiple.

—Year Three

Blow-up the x -axis. In this case there is only one chart to consider, the y -chart. (The strict transform of f is smooth in the other chart.) The strict transform f' of f is $y^{-m} f(x, y, yz)$. f' is (up to multiplication by a suitable unit) a normalized quasi-ordinary polynomial, with first characteristic pair $(\lambda', \mu') = (\lambda, \mu - 1)$ where (λ, μ) was the corresponding pair in year two. To see the general pattern, we

continue to assume $\lambda', \mu' \geq 1$. Therefore the multiplicity m has remained constant. We see that $E = \{H_x, H_y\}$ and $E^1 = \emptyset$. Clearly $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{G}_1 = \{(f', m)\}$, and we take $N_1 = (z)$. The coefficients $\mathcal{H}_1$ are generated again by $((x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'})^m, m)$, but now $\mathcal{E}_2 = E \setminus E^1 = \{H_x, H_y\}$ implies $D_2 = x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'}$. Then $\mu_2 = \lambda' + \mu'$ and $\nu_2 = 0$. The invariant sequence terminates if $\nu_i = 0$ or ∞ . Thus $\text{inv}_f = (m, 0; 0)$.

When $\nu_i = 0$, the center for the next blow-up is constructed out of the exceptional locus. List the elements of E by the order in which each arose in history; this can be done globally, not just for the current chart. (Thus we consider E to contain n elements after n blow-ups, most of which play no role in the calculation of inv_f at a given point). Any subset I of E can be ordered via the n -tuple $(\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n)$ where $\delta_i = 0$ if the i th element of E is not in I ; n -tuples are ordered lexicographically.

Returning to the determination of the center of blowing up, when $\nu_2 = 0$, define $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{(D_2, 1)\}$ and $S_{\text{inv}} = \{p \in N_1 \mid \mu_p(D_2) \geq 1\}$.

In the current setting,

$$S_{\text{inv}} = \{p \in N_1 \mid \mu_p(x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'}) \geq 1\} = (H_x \cap N_1) \cup (H_y \cap N_1),$$

the union of the x -axis and y -axis. The order of H_x is $(0, 1, 0)$ and the order of H_y is $(0, 0, 1)$. Thus H_x precedes H_y and the next center is $C = S_{\text{inv}} \cap H_x =$ the y -axis.

The procedure now takes on a stable pattern. So long as λ and μ both exceed 1, we have $\text{inv}_f = (m, 0; 0)$. We are forced to continue blowing up axes, which lowers either λ or μ by one each time. The corresponding divisor is blown away and replaced by a newer one, causing the choice of axes to alternate each time. Eventually one of λ or μ is driven smaller than one, and the requirement $\mu_p(D_2) \geq 1$ automatically selects the other axis ever after, until both $\lambda < 1$ and $\mu < 1$. If at this point we still have $\lambda + \mu \geq 1$, then the multiplicity still remains unchanged. But the condition $\mu_p(D_2) = \mu_p(x^\lambda y^\mu) \geq 1$ now selects the origin as the center, and in fact the origin is the maximum locus for the multiplicity ν_1 . We are forced to blow up the origin repeatedly until $\lambda + \mu < 1$. (Only x -charts and y -charts need be considered.) The multiplicity drops precisely when this occurs. Finally, it is clear that all of these decisions are completely determined by the arithmetic of the original pair (λ, μ) .

Except for which charts (x or y) we choose to consider in the first two years and the assumptions on (λ, μ) , the preceding completely describes how to reduce the multiplicity starting from year zero in the transversal case. Other starting assumptions (*e.g.*, $\lambda < 1$, $\mu \geq 1$) are entirely similar.

2.3. Stage Two. Once the multiplicity drops, the algorithm begins again; all previous history is forgotten. All exceptional divisors passing through the current point of interest are placed in E^1 (the set of “oldest” divisors). When the multiplicity drops for the first time, all the divisors are given by coordinate functions. In later stages this may not be true. The general phenomena occurring in later stages is completely illustrated by three examples.

Example 2.1. Suppose f is normalized, $\lambda + \mu < 1$, and $E = E^1 = \{H_x, H_y\}$. This is the usual situation the first time the multiplicity is lowered when we begin in the transversal case. Also, note that $\lambda\mu \neq 0$ since f is normalized.

As before, $\lambda + \mu < 1$ immediately implies the origin has higher multiplicity than nearby points. We are required to blow up the origin. Examine the x -chart. As

before, the multiplicity drops immediately. The new first characteristic pair is

$$(\lambda', \mu') = \left(\frac{1 - \lambda - \mu}{\mu}, \frac{1}{\mu} \right),$$

and the strict transform of f has the form

$$f' = z^m x^{m-\nu} + \cdots + y^{\mu m} \cdot \text{unit}.$$

Note that $\mu' > 1$ so we are again in the transversal case. We have $E = E^1 = \{H_x, H_y\}$. To normalize f' , we first permute y and z , and, up to a unit factor, get the configuration

$$(4) \quad f' = z^{\mu m} + \cdots + x^{m-\nu_1} y^m \cdot \text{unit}, \quad E = \{H_x, H_z\}.$$

But now f' may not be normalized; a quasi-ordinary branch ζ' may contain terms with integer exponents. Let $p(x, y)$ be the power series consisting of these terms, and apply transformation (i) of Lemma 1.2. It follows that $p(x, y)$ is divisible by $x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'}$. We now have $H_{z-p(x,y)} \in E^1 = E$. Since $N_1 = \{z = 0\}$ can be chosen as the first maximal contact space, both $(x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'} z^{\mu' m'}, m')$ and $(p(x, y), 1)$ will belong to the coefficient set $\mathcal{H}_1$, and by the divisibility relation between them, the latter function will have no effect on the calculation of inv_f . This relationship is preserved under blowing-up. Thus the divisor $H_{z-p(x,y)}$ behaves as though $p(x, y) = 0$.

Example 2.2. Suppose again that f is normalized and $\lambda + \mu < 1$ with $E = E^1 = \{H_x, H_y, H_{z-p(x,y)}\}$ where $x^\lambda y^\mu \mid p(x, y)$. This case may occur when Example 2.1 has lowered its multiplicity a second time.

Since f is in the non-transversal case, we must blow up the origin. In the z -chart, the divisor $H_{z-p(x,y)}$ is blown away and plays no further role. In the x -chart, the multiplicity drops immediately. As before, the strict transform f' requires two steps to be normalized: permute y and z , and then absorb integral powers in the quasi-ordinary branch. In the second step, we replace z by $z - q(x, y)$ where $x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'} \mid q(x, y)$ and $(\lambda', \mu') = \left(\frac{1 - \lambda - \mu}{\mu}, \frac{1}{\mu} \right)$. We need to see the effect of these changes on the elements of E^1 . Of course H_x is unaffected, and H_y becomes $H_{z-q(x,y)}$, which behaves as in Example 2.1. On the other hand, $H_{z-p(x,y)}$ becomes $H_{y-p(x,z-q(x,y))}$. By the divisibility properties of p and q , $y^\mu \mid p(x, y)$ and $x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'} \mid q(x, y)$. Since $N_1 = \{z = 0\}$ will again be the first contact space, it follows that the function $y - p(x, z - q(x, y))$ is equal to y up to a unit when restricted to N_1 . Thus $H_{y-p(x,z-q)}$ behaves like H_y through out the next stage of the resolution.

In Examples 2.1 and 2.2, we implicitly assumed that Lipman's formula for (λ', μ') result in a new first characteristic pair which is not entirely integral.

Example 2.3. Suppose f is normalized, $\lambda + \mu < 1$, $E = E^1 = \{H_x, H_y, H_{z-p(x,y)}\}$ with $x^\lambda y^\mu \mid p(x, y)$, and $(\lambda, \mu) = (\frac{a}{m}, \frac{1}{m})$ where $1 < a < m$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$.

As in Example 2.2, blow up the origin and consider the direction defined by x . The multiplicity of f' drops, but this time $(\lambda', \mu') = (m - a - 1, m)$. (The new pair becomes integral.) When f' is normalized, the "first" characteristic pair (λ', μ') has to be absorbed in the transformation $z \rightarrow z - q(x, y)$. Thus $q(x, y) = x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'} \cdot \text{unit}$. The strict transform has one fewer characteristic pairs. (Eventually f has to lose all its characteristic pairs to become smooth.)

Just as before, H_z becomes $H_{y-p(x,z-q(x,y))}$ and the latter is generated by (y) once we restrict to $N_1 = \{z = 0\}$. But while the transform $H_y \rightarrow H_{z-q(x,y)}$ as before, we now have $f' = z^{m'} + \dots + (x^{\lambda_2'} y^{\mu_2'})^{m'} \cdot \text{unit}$. The degree-zero coefficient of f' , $c_0' = (x^{\lambda_2'} y^{\mu_2'})^{m'} \cdot \text{unit}$, no longer divides $q(x,y)$. In fact the weighted “divisibility” relation is reversed: $q(x,y)$ “divides” c_0' . When we construct $\mathcal{H}_1$, it is q that principalizes the functions and determines the invariant, until H_{z-q} is blown away. Since the role of q in the process is determined by (λ, μ) , although (λ', μ') is integral and no longer counts as a characteristic pair, the process is still determined by the original characteristic data. We sketch the next phase of the resolution. The invariant for the configuration (f', E) is $(m', 3; 1, 0; 1, 0; \infty)$ and the next center is the origin. Blow-up the origin and consider the x direction; the multiplicity can't drop but H_x is blown away and replaced by a new divisor. The invariant records this as $(m', 2; 1, 1; 1, 0; \infty)$, and the origin is the center again. Blow up the origin and consider the y -direction; now H_x and H_y are “new” and belong to $\mathcal{E}_1$. The calculation now gives $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{(c_0, m'), (q, 1)\}$ and $D_2 = x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'}$, where $q(x, y) = x^{\lambda'} y^{\mu'} \cdot \text{unit}$. We have $\nu_2 = 0$, and $\text{inv}_f = (m', 1; 0)$. D_2 now determines the centers for blowing-up by $S = \{p \mid \mu_p(D_2) \geq 1\}$ and the ordering of the divisors in $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{H_x, H_y\}$. So we are required to blow up the x - and y -axis alternately until $\lambda' < 1$ and $\mu' < 1$; since (λ', μ') are integers, we continue until $\lambda' = \mu' = 0$ and $H_{z-q(x,y)}$ is blown away. The relation $q(x, y) \mid c_0(x, y)$ is maintained though-out, so when $H_{z-q(x,y)}$ is blown away we have $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{(c_0, m')\}$. Then since $c_0(x, y) = x^{\lambda_2} y^{\mu_2} \cdot \text{unit}$, the second characteristic pair (λ_2, μ_2) takes over the process.

Definition 2.4. *General Configuration.* Let f be a normalized quasi-ordinary singularity, and let (λ, μ) be the first characteristic pair. Furthermore, suppose f was obtained by applying the Bierstone-Milman algorithm to $\tilde{f}$ with characteristic pairs $\Lambda = \{(\tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\mu}_i)\}$. Let

$$E = E^1 \subset \{(z - q(x, y)), (y - q(x, z - p(x, y))), (x)\}$$

where

$$y - q(x, z - p(x, y)) \mid z = y \cdot \text{unit},$$

and $x^\lambda y^\mu \mid q(x, y)$, or $q(x, y) = x^a y^b \cdot \text{unit}$ and $x^a y^b \mid x^\lambda y^\mu$, and where (a, b) depends on Λ . Then E is called a general configuration.

Theorem 2.5. *At any stage in the resolution when the multiplicity of $f(x, y, z)$ has dropped, and f is expressed as a normalized quasi-ordinary singularity, the exceptional divisors constitute a general configuration.*

Proof. The theorem is trivial in the base case. We have shown it to be true at the end of the base case, and in representative examples of the general case. A complete proof involves checking the calculations for each possible subset of the general configuration, and seeing that in each case the final set of divisors (once f is normalized) is again a general configuration. The calculations are similar in all cases to the three examples we presented above. $\square$

Since the controlling function in every case depends only on characteristic data, we have

Theorem 2.6. *The Bierstone-Milman canonical resolution algorithm for a quasi-ordinary singularity (V, p) depends only on the (normalized) characteristic pairs.*

Example 2.7. We will find locally an embedded resolution for (V, p) defined by $f(x, y, z) = z^3 + x^2y^4$. The function f has one characteristic pair $(2/3, 4/3)$.

—Year 0

In the beginning, $\inf_f(O) = (3, 0; 2, 0; 1, 0; \infty)$ and the center is the origin O . Blow up O and consider the x -chart.

—Year 1

$f = z^3 + x^3y^4$, $\inf_f(O) = (3, 0; 4/3, 1; 1, 0; \infty)$ and $E = \{H_x\}$; the center is again the origin. Blow up the origin and consider the y -chart.

—Year 2

$f = z^3 + x^3y^4$ and $\inf_f(O) = (3, 0; 0)$ The centers are now determined by $D_2 = xy^{4/3}$ and the ordering of the divisors $E = \{H_x, H_y\}$. Since H_x is older, we first blow up $H_x \cap N_1$ which is the y -axis.

—Year 3

$f = z^3 + y^4$, $\inf_f(O) = (3, 0; 0)$, $D_2 = y^{4/3}$. Blow up the x -axis, and consider the y -chart.

—Year 4

$f = z^3 + y$. The multiplicity has dropped, and the strict transform is now smooth, but the divisors do not have normal crossing with f . If we “normalize” f as a quasi-ordinary singularity, we see that f has lost its only characteristic pair: the previous characteristic pair becomes $(0, 1/3)$, which becomes integral when we normalize by the transformation $y \leftrightarrow z, z \rightarrow z + y^3$. We have $f = z$, and $E = E^1 = \{H_x, H_{z-y^3}\}$. Since the multiplicity just dropped, we begin again, regarding the current state as year 0. We have $\inf_f(O) = (1, 2; 1, 0; 3, 0; \infty)$ and the center to blow up is the origin O . Blow up and consider the x -chart.

—Year 1

In the x -chart we have $f = z$ and $E = \{H_x, H_{z-x^2y^3}\}$. Since of course the multiplicity cannot drop, the new divisor H_x does not belong to E^1 . We have $\inf_f(O) = (1, 1; 3, 1; 1, 0; \infty)$ and the next center is the origin. Blow up and consider the y -chart.

—Year 2

$f = z$ and $E = \{H_x, H_y, H_{z-x^2y^4}\}$. Now we have $E^1 = \{H_{z-x^2y^4}\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{H_x, H_y\}$, which leads to $\inf_f(O) = (1, 1; 0)$ and $D_2 = x^2y^4$. All remaining centers are determined by D_2 , the exponents of which came from the integral pair $(0, 3)$ and the transformations of Lemma 1.2 occurring in the last two steps. As in the last cycle, we blow up the y -axis.

—Year 3

$f = z$ and $E^1 = \{H_{z-xy^4}\}$, and $\inf_f(O) = (1, 1; 0)$. Blow up the x -axis and consider the y -chart.

—Year 4

$f = z$ and $E^1 = \{H_{z-xy^3}\}$. Blow up the y -axis and consider the x -chart.

—Year 5–8

In year 5, $f = z$ and $E^1 = \{H_{z-y^3}\}$. Now $D_2 = y^3$ and only the x -axis is selected. Blow up the x -axis three more times. In year 8, $f = z$ and $E = \{H_x, H_y, H_{z-1}\}$. We have $\inf_f(O) = (1, 0; 0)$. The invariant $\inf_f$ is now locally constant everywhere on f , and we have achieved an embedded resolution.

REFERENCES

- A. S. S. Abhyankar, *Resolution of Singularities of Embedded Algebraic Surfaces*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics (2nd Edition), 1998.
- BM1. E. Bierstone and P. Milman, *A simple constructive proof of canonical resolution of singularities*, Effective Methods in Algebraic Geometry, Progress in Math **94** (1991), 11–30.
- BM2. ———, *Resolution of singularities*, preprint (alg-geom/9709028).
- EV. S. Encinas and O. Villamayor, *Good points and algorithmic resolution of singularities*, Preprint.
- G. Y.-N. Gau, *Embedded topological classification of quasi-ordinary singularities*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **74** (1988), 109–129.
- H. H. Hironaka, *Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero I, II*, Annals of Mathematics **79** (1964), 109–326.
- L1. J. Lipman, *Quasi-ordinary singularities of embedded surfaces*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1965.
- L2. ———, *Quasi-ordinary singularities of surfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$* , Singularities (Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **40**), Amer. Math. Soc. Providence 1983, Part 2, 161–171.
- L3. ———, *Topological invariants of quasi-ordinary singularities*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **74** (1988), 1–107.
- M. T.T. Moh, *Canonical uniformization of hypersurface singularities of characteristic zero*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra (to appear).
- O. U. Orbanz, *Embedded resolution of algebraic surfaces after Abhyanka (characteristic 0)*, Lecture Notes in Math., **1101**, Springer, 1984.
- V. O. Villamayor, *Constructiveness of Hironaka’s resolution*, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup. 4^e serie. t.22 (1989), 1–32

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, MANSFIELD, OHIO 44906

E-mail addresses: cban@math.ohio-state.edu, mcewan@math.ohio-state.edu